

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-25 are pending in the present invention.

In the previous office action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mikurak (U.S. Patent No. 6,606,744) in view of Wyatt (U.S. Patent No. 6,041,411). In response, Applicants submitted arguments contending that the combination of the cited references did not teach or suggest the present invention, as recited in independent claims 1, 10, 15 and 17. In particular, Applicants asserted that the Mikurak in view of Wyatt failed to teach or suggest “resolving the at least one unresolved attribute in the selected unresolved package by accessing the package data correlated to the selected unresolved package,” where the package data is in “a catalog entry table” in a “catalog database.” In response to Applicants’ arguments, the Examiner stated in the Final Office Action:

In reply to the above arguments, the examiner points out that Mikurak specifically discloses the steps as recited by applicant in claims 1, 10, 15 and 17 for enabling the purchase of a package via an e-commerce system [e.g., Fig. 121 and associated texts]. Still Further, Mikurak clearly discloses a problem handling unit [e.g., the unit: 1502, Fig. 21] to hand the features as claimed. Additionally, Wyatt discloses an Electronic Commerce application system [e.g., Fig. (s) 3-10 and associated texts] resolving the unresolved attribute of products in a package [e.g., the decision units: 56, 66, Fig. 3] by accessing the package data [e.g., the unit: 120, Fig. 6 and associated texts] correlated to the selected unresolved package [e.g., Fig. 5 and associated texts] via the client catalog file merge program [e.g., col. 9, lines 24-28] to build a integrated cataloged file having details as shown in catalog entry table 150, Fig. 7 and being stored in a catalog database [e.g., the unit 300, Fig. 10] of a client computer [e.g., the unit 12, Fig. 10]. Hence, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would in fact, contrary to applicant’s arguments, look to incorporate the well-known technique as taught by Wyatt in Mikurak’s system for direct accessing the package data correlated to the selected unresolved package such that the product is to be automatically launched upon purchase [e.g., Wyatt: col. 10, lines 30-40].

Applicants respectfully disagree.

Mikurak is related to a sprawling network system that includes “transfer of information across the internet utilizing telephony routing information and internet protocol address

information.” (Abstract). In one embodiment, Mikurak provides “a new kind of web architecture framework (called “WAF” in this document) that secures, administers, and audits electronic information use.” (Col. 82, lines 8-10). The WAF can be employed to generate a framework “like the one shown in FIG. 53 to support various features such as an electronic commerce component 5300, a content channels component 5302, an administrative component 5304, a customer relationship management component 5306, . . . or a web customer service component 5312.” (Col. 82, lines 1-7).

Mikurak is generally related to enabling and supporting commerce related web application services, such as shopping from a virtual catalog (col. 91, line 15 et seq.). In one section, Mikurak describes allowing a customer to buy products and services from a virtual catalog (col. 91, lines 17-42; Figure 54), and in another section, Mikurak describes a shopping cart function (col. 96, line 20 to col. 98, line 50). In yet another section, Mikurak describes allowing a customer to customize an item for purchase (col. 100, lines 1-42).

Wyatt is directed to minimizing the potential for unauthorized use of digital information, particularly software programs, digital content and other computer information, by verifying user access rights to electronically transmitted digital information. In Wyatt, a second computer system transmits requested digital information to a requesting first computing system in wrapped form, which includes digital instructions that must be successfully executed, or unwrapped, before access to the digital information is allowed. Successful unwrapping requires that certain conditions must be verified in accordance with the digital instructions, thereby allowing access to the digital information.

Together Mikurak in view of Wyatt teaches a web-based commerce system that delivers executable digital products to purchasers. The executable digital products are “wrapped”

according to Wyatt so that only the intended and authorized recipient is able to utilize the product.

Independent Claims 1, 10, 15 and 17

Mikurak in view of Wyatt fails to teach or suggest “resolving the at least one unresolved attribute in the selected unresolved package by accessing the package data correlated to the selected unresolved package,” where the package data is in “a catalog entry table” in a “catalog database.” Contrary to the Examiner’s assertion, Mikurak’s “problem handling unit” (unit 1502 in FIG. 21) does just that --- handle problems. In particular, the unit receives trouble notifications, determines the cause and refers the problem to another module for resolution, tracks the progress of the resolution, initiates an action to reconfigure, if needed, generates trouble tickets to suppliers, confirms that the problem is cleared with the customer, and schedules planned maintenance (see FIG. 21). Nothing mentions or suggests “resolving the at least one unresolved attribute in the selected unresolved package by accessing the package data correlated to the selected unresolved package,” where the package data is in “a catalog entry table” in a “catalog database.”

Moreover, Wyatt similarly fails to teach or suggest this feature. In the Final Office Action, the Examiner states that determining whether a client computer has been previously registered with the server system (step 56 of FIG. 3) and determining whether the client’s payment information is valid (step 66 of FIG. 3) teaches “resolving the at least one unresolved attribute of the one or more products in the selected unresolved package.” According to the present invention, an “unresolved package includes one or more *products* with at least one unresolved attribute” (claim 1). The resolution module resolves the unresolved attributes so that the unresolved package becomes resolved --- e.g., products with fully resolved attributes. In

Wyatt, the client is ordering a digital product, e.g., software, from a product provider. FIG. 3 describes the process for purchasing the product. Steps 56 and 66 describe how the server system checks to see if the customer has registered previously, i.e., is a returning customer, and if the payment information is valid, respectively. These two things, the registration status of the customer and the validity of the payment information, are not unresolved attributes of the *product* ordered.

Furthermore, the Examiner asserts that the these two things are resolved by accessing the return message 120 (FIG. 6). The Examiner contends that the “package data” is the return message 120 (FIG. 6) and that the “selected unresolved package” is the purchase request message 100 (FIG. 5). Applicants respectfully submit, however, that nothing in Wyatt teaches or suggests that the purchase request message 100 (selected unresolved package) contains “products” with at least one unresolved attribute, and that such attributes are resolved by accessing the return message 120 (FIG. 6) transmitted from the server to the customer in response to a purchase request message 100 (FIG. 5). Nothing in Wyatt teaches or suggests that resolving steps 56 and 66 involves accessing the return message. Indeed, this message does not contain information that can answer the questions posed by steps 56 and 66. (See column 9, lines 5- 23).

Because Mikurak in view of Wyatt fails to teach or suggest the cooperation of elements recited in claims 1, 10, 15 and 17, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 10, 15 and 17 are allowable over the cited references. Because claims 2-9, 11-14, 16, and 18-25 depend on claims 1, 10, 15 and 17, the above arguments are applicable, and for the reasons presented above, they too are allowable over the cited references.

Claims 2, 11, 16 and 18

Applicants respectfully maintain that claims 2, 11, 16 and 18 are allowable over Mikurak

in view of Wyatt because the combination fails to teach or suggest “a product attribute table” and “a product attribute value table,” as recited in claims 2, 11, 16 and 18. In the prior response, Applicants argued that the cited portion of Mikurak described an item catalog screen on which information on items was provided. The consumer places items into the shopping basket and the consumer is able to examine the shopping basket’s contents at any time. There is no mention or suggestion of “a product attribute table” that “defines for each product at least one attribute type associated with the product,” and/or “a product attribute value table” that “defines at least one value for each attribute type,” as recited in claims 2, 11, 16 and 18.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner did not address Applicants’ arguments. Applicants respectfully resubmit that claims 2, 11, 16 and 18 are allowable over the cited references.

Claims 12, 13, 14, 19, 20 and 21

Applicants respectfully maintain that claims 12, 13, 14, 19, 20, and 21 are allowable over Mikurak in view of Wyatt because Mikurak fails to teach or suggest utilizing the various tables described above in claims 2, 11, 16 and 18 in the manner recited in claims 12-14 and 19-21, to resolve unresolved attributes in one or more products in a package. Wyatt is silent to these aspects as well.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner did not address these arguments. For this reason, Applicants respectfully resubmit that claims 12-14 and 19-21 are allowable over Mikurak in view of Wyatt.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claims 1-25 are allowable over the cited references. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the claims as now presented.

Applicant's attorney believes that this application is in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,
SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

September 29, 2005
Date

/Joyce Tom/ Reg. No. 48,681
Joyce Tom
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 48, 681
(650) 493-4540